

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INTELLIGENCE WASHINGTON, DC 20310

REPLY TO

2 4 JUL 1984

DAMI-CIS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE STUDY DIRECTOR, INTERAGENCY GROUP/ COUNTERMEASURES, WASHINGTON, DC

SUBJECT:

Countermeasures Macro Resource Study Data Call

(Physical Security)

The enclosed Department of the Army report concerning physical security countermeasures resource data is provided per your Memorandum, D/ICS-84-0803, subject: Fourth Countermeasures Macro Resource Study Data Call, dated 5 April 1984. FOR THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INTELLIGENCE:

1 Encl

LTC(P), GS

Director of Counterintelligence

ARMY review completed.

Received in PPG on 10 Aug 84.

Phy SD got it on 9 Aug 84

It previously went to 936 Cop C.

Originally addressed "The Study Director"

16/CM,

Wash. D.C. 20505 Wash. D.C. 2

Apparently connected to CIA.

Mr. Bjorkman/56481

Typed by C. Janis

Abow come it's not class.

2 4 JUL 1984

DAMI-CIS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE STUDY DIRECTOR, INTERAGENCY GROUP/ COUNTERMEASURES, WASHINGTON, DC 20505

SUBJECT: Countermeasures Macro Resource Study Data Call (Physical Security)

The enclosed Department of the Army report concerning physical security countermeasures resource data is provided per your Memorandum, D/ICS-84-0803, subject: Fourth Countermeasures Macro Resource Study Data Call, dated 5 April 1984.

FOR THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INTELLIGENCE:

signed Frank Dill

1 Encl

LANCE R. CORNINE LTC(P), GS Director of Counterintelligence

> Mr. Bjorkman/56481 Typed by C. Janis

Department of the Army Countermeasures Resource Data Call - Physical Security (RCS: CSGID(OT) 162)

Fiscal Year 1983

1.	Total physical security costs:	\$270,000,000.
2.	Estimated percentage which applies to the physical protection of classified information:	\$ 53,000,000. (5%)
3.	Estimated costs for contractors to meet physical security program requirements:	\$ 40,000,000.
4.	Equipment (e.g., fencing, special lighting, special construction, intrusion detection/alarm systems, locking devices etc.,):	\$ 15,000,000.
5.	Military and civilian personnel (e.g., guard forces, investigators directly chargeable to physical security):	\$ 52,000,000.
6.	Personnel physical protection (special equipment e.g., arm- ored cars, bullet-proof or re- sistent clothing, communicat- ion, eto.;):	\$ 7,000,000.
7.	Administration (including train- ing, physical security educ- ation, record maintenance etc.,):	\$ 8,600,000.
8.	Research and Development:	\$ 4,000,000.
9.	Operating costs (e.g., badging, access control, patrolling, dogs shipment control etc.,):	\$ 9,500,000.
10.	Logistics (space, communications, ADP, etc.,):	\$ 11,700,000.

Department of the Army Countermeasures Resource Data Call - Physical Security (RCS: CSGID(OT) 162)

Fiscal Year 1984

1.	Total physical security costs:	\$305,800,000.	
2.	Estimated percentage which applies to the physical protection of classified information:	\$ 65,000,000.	(5%)
3.	Estimated costs for contractors to meet physical security program requirements:	\$ 41,500,000.	
4.	Equipment (e.g., fencing, special lighting, special construction, intrusion detection/alarm systems, locking devices etc.,):	\$ 19,300,000.	
5.	Military and civilian personnel (e.g., guard forces, investigators directly chargeable to physical security):	\$ 55,600,000.	
6.	Personnel physical protection (special equipment e.g., arm- ored cars, bullet-proof or re- sistent clothing, communicat- ion, eto.;):	\$ 8,000,000.	
7.	Administration (including train- ing, physical security educ- ation, record maintenance etc.,):	\$ 10,000,000.	
8.	Research and Development:	\$ 3,000,000.	
9.	Operating costs (e.g., badging, access control, patrolling, dogs shipment control etc.,):	\$ 12,500,000.	
10.	Logistics (space, communications, ADP, etc.,):	\$ 12,700,000.	

Department of the Army Countermeasures Resource Data Call - Physical Security (RCS: CSGID(OT) 162)

Fiscal Year 1985

1.	Total physical security costs:	\$ 350,000,000.	
2.	Estimated percentage which applies to the physical protection of classified information:	\$ 78,000,000.	(5%)
3.	Estimated costs for contractors to meet physical security program requirements:	\$ 44,000,000.	
4.	Equipment (e.g., fencing, spec- ial lighting, special construct- ion, intrusion detection/alarm systems, locking devices etc.,):	\$ 20,000,000.	
5.	Military and civilian personnel (e.g., guard forces, investigators directly chargeable to physical security):	\$ 63,500,000.	
6.	Personnel physical protection (special equipment e.g., armored cars, bullet-proof or resistent clothing, communication, etc.,):	\$ 8,000,000.	
7.	Administration (including train- ing, physical security educ- ation, record maintenance etc.,):	\$ 9,700,000.	
8.	Research and Development:	\$ 3,500,000.	
9.	Operating costs (e.g., badging, access control, patrolling, dogs shipment control etc.,):	\$ 10,800,000.	
10.	Logistics (space, communications, ADP, etc.,):	\$ 13,600,000.	

Department of the Army Countermeasures Resource Data Call - Physical Security

NARRATIVE

This consolidated report is based on feeder information received from fourteen major subordinate commands worldwide and a like number of Headquarters, Department of the Army staff activities within the Washington DC metropolitan area. cause countermeasures resource data information is not segregated from other budget or expended funds and, in many instances, is buried within non-security related programs and construction projects with pertinent data interspersed in offices such as Engineers, Security Managers, Comptroller, Logisticians, etc., its development was truly time consuming and difficult. To illustrate the varied estimative process— used in preparation of this report one MACOM directed selected installations (one Corps, one Division and one CONUS Army) to provide the required resource data to the best of their ability. That input was then used by the MACOM as a multiplier of similar activities throughout their command resulting in a faily accurate, common-sense methodology. One reporting command met with resistance from contractors when attempting to coordinate physical security data figures. They were informed by the contractors that such costs were not separate items in contractor cost data and could not be readily provided nor readily determined. Many contractors refused to provide the information unless a service contract was let for that purpose. In those instances, cost data was developed estimatively based on available user agency records.